DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 651 IR 013 361

AUTHOR Koetting, J. Randall
TITLE Educational Connoisseurship and Educational Criticism: Pushing beyond Information and Effectiveness.
PUB DATE Jan 88
NOTE 17p.; In: Proceedings of Selected Research Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (New Orleans, LA, January 14-19, 1988). For the complete proceedings, see IR 013 331.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Principles; *Educational Theories; *Evaluation Methods; Language Role; *Models; *Qualitative Research; *School Effectiveness; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Educational Criticism

ABSTRACT

The dominant model of schooling is a technical-rational management model based on behavioral, positivistic, quasi-scientific language, which has shifted attention from the art and craft of teaching to the "science and technology" of teaching. However, this model and the language which it uses limit educational thinking. Emphasis on value-neutrality in the form of observation has led to domination of the field of education by an "if-then" mentality, a reduction of the cause-effect model borrowed from natural science. An alternative mode, based on Eisner's notion of educational connoisseurship and educational criticism, provides educational evaluation that is qualitative in nature, with the critic in education following the example of critics in literature, theater, film, music, and other visual arts. The mode of discourse used in this alternative paradigm is non-discursive and metaphorical, and the critic draws upon his knowledge/conceptual/experimental base to describe, interpret, and evaluate what he experiences. The interplay of the descriptive, interpretive, and evaluative aspects provide multiple perspectives that serve to expand the dialogue of educators to alternative possibilities, and to help educators appreciate the complexities of the educational process. (34 references) (EW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295651

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

[X] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EDUCATIONAL CONNOISSEURSHIP AND EDUCATIONAL CRITICISM: PUSHING BEYOND INFORMATION AND EFFECTIVENESS

J. Randall Koetting
Associate Professor
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078
(405) 624-7122

Fifth Annual Open Forum On
The Foundational Issues Of The Field

Association for Educational Communications and Technology
Annual Conference
New Orleans, Louisiana
January 14-19, 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael Simonson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR013361

> ...our language promotes a view, a way of looking at things, as well as a content to be observed. This language, I am arguing, derives from a set of images, of what schools should be, of how children should be taught, and of how the consequences of schooling should be identified. Language serves to reinforce and legitimize those images. Because differences between, say, terms such as instruction and teaching are subtle, we often use a new word without recognizing that the new word is capable of creating s new world. (Eisner, 1985, p.355)

The power of words (languaging) is probably the most overlooked, least understood, and ultimately most neglected phenomenon in the field of education. Words serve to produce a paradoxical situation: words can both "freeze" and "unfreeze" reality. It is my contention that the language of the dominant paradigm for educational thought tends to provide more of a "freezing" function.

This paper has a dual purpose. First, I present a brief description and critique of the dominant model of schooling. Secondly, I offer an alternative paradigm for analyzing school practice. The freezing of educational reality can be seen in the almost exclusive use of a technical-rational, management model of school practice, based on behavioral, positivistic, quasi-scientific language. This has become the dominant way of perceiving and talking about schooling. The current emphasis and obsession with students' scores on standardized tests has shifted attention from the art and craft of teaching to the "science and technology" of teaching. This has primarily taken the form of perceiving and talking about schooling from an effective schools/teaching model (Hunter, 1984; Lazotte & Bancroft, 1985). Another example of this model is found in management/systems thinking applied to the instructional process ; a reductionist view of the teaching/learning process which severely limits ways of looking at, talking about and living with students.(1)

An alternative model for analyzing school practice is offered by Elliott Eisner's (1985a) notion of educational connoisseurship and educational criticism. I will argue that Eisner's aesthetic paradigm can provide education a broader conceptual base from which to work in better understanding the complexities of the schooling process. This conceptual base givese educators a more diverse language system for understanding and interpreting what they see, and, vice versa, what they see and observe is not limited to forms of expression that use technical language.

The importance of examining the language base of educational paradigms/models cannot be over stressed. Educators use and/or invent words to serve as tools and their perceptions become controlled by these creations. Language which is intended to explain or describe reality, becomes reality. What can't be explained (or programmed into a computer) is too often ignored and ultimately dismissed. I am arguing that the way we talk about a phenomenon determines what we see before we look. The language of a field encourages human encounters to be a priori. If we are to pursue the reality of the teaching-learning act, educators must uncover the meanings of words blurred by custom and usage and be willing to examine the conceptual-base of their views of school practice.(2)

The Dominant Paradigm of Schooling

Wanting teachers to be effective and competent seems to be a reasonable expectation. However, designing the means of determining teaching effectiveness and teacher competency becomes complex. Traditionally, the major thrust in teaching effectiveness and teacher competency studies has been an emphasis on designing research studies that focus on the technical and political aspects of the teaching-learning experience. Basically, this research includes studies concerned with various instructional methodologies and pupil achievement (Fisher, Mariave, & Filby, 1979; Good, Biddle, & Brophy, 1975; Russell & Fea, 1963), teacher characteristics and teaching effectiveness (Coker, Medley, & Soar, 1980; Getzels & Jackson, 1963; Raskow, Airasion, & Madaue, 1978), and teacher behaviors as related to pupil achievement (Good, 1979; Rosenshine, 1976; Withall & Lewis, 1963).

In these paradigms for studying teaching effectiveness and teacher competency, little attention is focused on the nature of the research questions or why they were posed. To be satisfied with asking the right research question is not enough. Responsible educators must ask why the question was asked and why it was phrased in a particular manner. The scope and nature of research questions cannot be neglected. Scientific investigation is not value-neurtal.

A possible, and often overlooked, explanation causing the study of teaching effectiveness to follow technical lines of investigation may be the language of teaching. The power of language to influence or direct the study of teaching is supported by Soltis (1973), who suggests that a complex educational system develops a specialized voacbulary. Educational words have power--the power to direct the procedures and purposes of researchers. Typical words used in research on teaching effectiveness are behavior (student and teacher), effectiveness, personality, achievement, outcomes, interaction, characteristics, behavioral measurements, and performance. More recently, the literature is using such words as direct instruction, time on task, assignments, expectations, monitoring, pupil task involvement, seat work, and a whole host of terms reflecting technical and political value bases. The metaphorical bases of these words are industrial, military, and disease (medical). For example:

Industrial - classroom management, cost effectiveness,
efficiency, institutional planning,

programming, output measures, product, feedback, defective, input-process-output, quality control, time management.

Military - target population, information system, centralization of power, line and staff, scheduling, discipline, objectives, teaching strategies, maintain.

Disease - diagnosis, treatment, prescription, remediation, monitor, label, deviant, impaired, referral-procedure, special needs.

These metaphors encourage teaching-learning research to be viewed and investigated from a technical perspective. Researchers invented words to serve as tools and now they are controlled by these tools. Language which is intended to explain or describe reality too often becomes the reality. What cannot be explained with language is often ignored and ultimately dismissed. As mentioned earlier, words serve to produce a paradoxical situation, namely, the freezing and unfreezing of reality. This is due to the technical emphasis on defining terms, along with the emphasis on observable behavior to explain the human condition. If researchers are to pursue the roots of reality relative to teaching-learning, they must uncover the meaning of words blurred by custom and usage. Researchers of teaching effectiveness are affected by language and, more often than not, their research efforts reflect the posed meaning these words possess.

As expressed by Frymier (1972, p.13), there are languages of conditional relationships and relationships "without conditions": the first is a language of "control"; the second is a language of "love and growth." One has to wonder if teaching effectiveness has as its priority control or learning (love and growth). Roberts (1976, p.321) echoed this sentiment when she wrote, "It is impossible to practice the ideas of Skinner and Chomsky simultaneously."

Heubner (1966) discusses the dangers involved in the languaging activity. He refers to the language of the technical model in education as the prevailing focus during the past few years. Heubner, according to Macdonald (1977, p.15), "...opens the possibilities of political, aesthetic, and moral talk."

The language of the technical model applied to teaching effectiveness research has contributed to a simplistic, input/output understanding of educational experiences ("student-as-product" orientation). The technical model, along with the technical-rational language, suggests that the "right mix" of technique and content will significantly increase student performance. Teaching is viewed as a "science and technology" with identifiable skills lending themselves to short-term teaching goals that focus on a utilitarian perspective. Tabachnick, Popkowitz and Zeichner (1979-80) suggest that this leads to a managerial understanding of teaching.

The language of the technical model applied to teaching effectiveness suggests scientific accuracy and predictability, and the nature of this model

has an interest in control (management and engineering). The historical roots of this orientation have been outlined by others (Apple, 1979; Giroux, 1980; Kliebard, 1975). Tabachnick et al. (1979-80, p.16), in their research on the student-teaching experience, observed student teachers engaged in the "routine and mechanistic teaching of precise and short-term skills and in management activities designed to keep the class quiet, orderly, and on task."

As the teaching profession has become an increasingly highly skilled technology with a primary emphasis on methods and outcomes, teachers have been rewarded for guiding their practice in ways amenable to this technology. As Macdonald suggests (1975), this notion implies that "teachers are potentially interchangeable," and leads to viewing productive activity as something learned and performed "mechanistically." Thus, any "good" teaching activity can be reproduced by any other teacher, and "...all productive teaching is measureable in terms of the criteria of the accountability in use" (pp.79-80).

Apple (1982) refers to this as a process of "deskilling-reskilling" teachers:

> As the procedures of technical control enter into the school in the guise of pre-designed curricular/teaching/evaluation 'systems,' teachers are being deskilled. Yet they are also being reskilled in a way that is quite consequential. ...while the deskilling involves the loss of craft, the ongoing atrophication of educational skills, the reskilling involves substitution of the skills with ideological visions of management. (p.256)

Tom (1977) contends that what is lacking in the managerial perspective is the acknowledgment of interpersonal or social relationships:

> ...these relationships cannot be reduced to a collection of techniques without debasing them and stripping them of their humanity. However, even if one rejects this humanistic concern, there is another fundamental problem. A technology must have definite ends toward which its activity is aimed. There is, of course, no long-term consensus on the aims of education. (p.78)

The lack of consensus on the aims of education within the technical model is not viewed as problematic because there are commonsense understandings of purpose within the model. The position here becomes one of value-neutrality, that is, teaching and learning as apolitical.

Giroux (1980) suggests that the political nature of education programs is seen in the language used to address everyday school practices. Stating that teacher education programs serve as socializing agencies enbodying "...rules and patterns for constructing and legitimizing categories regarding competence, achievement, and success," (p.8) he suggests that this, in turn, serves to define specific teacher roles

> ...through the language they use and the assumptions and research they consider essential to the teaching profession. The basic premises and rules that underlie such programs usually viewed as commonsence perceptions; they go unquestioned and often result in many problems in the teaching arena to be defined as basically technical areas.

In the same vein, Foshay (1980) proclaims the importance of language and its linkage to practice. He states:

> It is scarcely recognized the way we talk and think has a controlling effect. Behind our manifest language is a metaphor which carries latent meanings to events. Behind our action is also theory about the domain of action. (p.82)

Foshay's contention provides a clear picture of how theory and practice, talk and action are underlying sequences in everyday events and, quite possibly, research efforts. Haplin (9169) lends support when he states:

> But if the word is only as good as the idea behind it, we as educators should ask questions more frequently than we do, not just what this or that educational word means, but to what assumptions, values, theories, procedures, and strategies for teaching do these words commit us. (p.335)

Certain words used in teaching-learning research help us to "see" teaching effectiveness in a certain way, or ways of "seeing" teaching-learning have generated certain language systems. Casual priority does not seem particularly important here. What is important is the current language used connotes a simplistic technical view of teaching-learning.

Discussion

The non-neutrality of methods of inquiry has been argued by Habermas (1971) (3). Educators have argued the non-neutrality of education as a process (e.g. Apple, 1979; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1986; Dobson, Dobson, & Koetting, 1985; Eisner, 1985a & 1985b; Freire, 1970; etc.). However, the encouraged model of perception in teaching is one of value-neutrality in the form of observation. Certain behavioral characterictics of children are classified and labeled and teachers are trained to see these. This activity has resulted in the field of teacher education abounding with an "if-then" mentality, a reduction of the cause-effect model borrowed from natural science. If a child exhibits a certain behavior, then an appropriate treatment is prescribed. Apple (1979) argues that educators have borrowed a reconstructued logic of science and applied it to curriculum and pedagogical research and practice.

Patterns of thought or the usage of language schemes borrowed from the

natural sciences simply do not fit summarily the social sciences. Exactness and precision are needed when dealing with things (natural sciences) for purposes of prediction and control. However, lattitude and flexibility are needed when dealing with humans for purposes of growth, emancipation, and understanding.

Apple (1975a) contends that "...two major problems in education historically have been our inability to deal with ambiguity, to see it as a positive characteristic, and our continual pursuit of naive and simplistic answers to complex human dilemms" (p.127). He continues by suggesting that phenomenologists seek to cast aside their previous perceptions of familiar objects and attempt to reconstruct them. The work of the phenomenologist is to see the phenomenon as it is rather than as it is suggested. The basic question becomes one of whether or not "familiar" educational constructs for viewing and speaking of children are adequate relative to the potential of children.

The consequences of an over-reliance on a technical-rational, scientific, management model for viewing the process of schooling have been numerous. So, too, the impact of the language used in this model. Eisner (1985a) identifies six consequences that he sees as most important. The first consequence is that a "scientific epistemology" dominates as the only legitimate means of educational inquiry. All other views are excluded (p.17). Secondly, this "scientific epistemology" in education is preoccupied with control. This has resulted in attempts at developing "teacher proof" curriculum materials and, diagnostic/prescriptive models of teaching (pp. 17-18). A third consequence is a preoccupation with "standardized outcomes," manifested in the current "testing movement" and teacher accountability/effectiveness (p.19). Fourth, students have no role/participation in developming educational programs because "the provision for such opportunities would make the system difficult to control, hard for educators to manage, and complex to evaluate" (p. 19). A fifth consequence is fragmenting the curriculum. This results in breaking up complex tasks into smaller, "almost microunits of behavior and in the process to render much of the curriculum meaningless to children" (p.20). A sixth consequence is that educational language has become an "emotionally eviscerated form of expression; any sense of the poetic or the passionate must be excised. Instead, the aspiration is to be value neutral and technical. It is better to talk about subjects than students, better to refer to treatment than to teaching, better to measure than to judge, better to deal with outputs than results" (p.20).

A way to address the limitations and consequences of the technical model identified by Eisner is to reconceptualize the schooling process. For example, Eisner (1985a) states that we need educational theory that "unapologetically recognizes the artistry of teaching" (p.22); that we need to develop "methods that will help us understand the kind of experience children have in school and not only the kind of behavior they display" (p.22). To gain an appreciation of educational experience will require methods of analysis and language forms that are different from the technical model. What the study of education needs

> ...is not a new orthodoxy but rather a variety of new assumptions and methods that will help us appreciate the richness of educational practice, that will be useful for revealing the subtleties of its consequences for all to see (Eisner, p.23).

Professionals must deal not only with what they see but with why they see what they see (Dobson, Dobson, & Koetting, 1985). The way educators look at (perceive), talk about (language), and live with (experience) children is an area worthy of critical analysis. The remainder of the paper explores one alternative framework for viewing schooling that adresses the consequences of Eisner, that allows for the complexities of schooling and that accepts the interplay of perception, language and values that are at work in looking at schooling.

An Alternative Perception of the Practice of Schooling

The inherent limitations of the technical model of schooling and its attended language system cannot be over come by "fine-tuning" the model. What is needed is an alternative conceptual base for looking at and talking about schooling. One such alternative model with an attended language system is Elliot W. Eisner's notion of educational connoisseurship and educational criticism. Eisner (1985a) states that "this form of educational inquiry, a species of educational evaluation, is qualitative in character and takes its lead from the work that critics have done in literature, theater, film, music, and the visual arts" (p.216).

Eisner (1985a) contends that there are two forms of qualitative inquiry in the arts. Artists use a qualitative form of inquiry when they become involved in making statements about reality through their art. The result is a "qualitative whole - a symphony, poem, painting, ballet - that has the capacity to evoke in the intelligent percipient a kind of experience that leads us to call the work art" (p.217). This is one form of qualitative inquiry. The second form is found "in the work of those who inquire into the work of artists, namely the art critics. The art critic finds himself or herself with the difficult task of rendering the essentially ineffable qualities constituting works of art into a language that will help others perceive the work more deeply" (p.217).

The critic's work is to be a "midwife to perception", i.e. he/she must use their knowledge (connoisseurship) to make public the qualities that make up the work of art so that others may see the work more comprehensively. The critic's task is not to pass judgment, but to lift " the veils that keep the eyes from seeing" (Eisner, 1985a, p.217). Thus criticism is defined as the "art of disclosure" (p.219)

Eisner identifies two important points about criticism. First criticism is an "empirical" endeavor, i.e. "the qualities the critic describes or renders must be capable of being located in the subject matter of the criticism. In this sense, the test of criticism is in its instrumental effects on the perception of works of art" (Eisner, 1985a, p.217). Thus criticism aims at

understanding "qualities and their relationships."

The second point Eisner makes about criticism is that "anything can be its subject matter." Here, Eisner points out that criticism does not refer to "the negative appraisal of something but rather the illumination of something's qualities so that an appraisal of its value can be made" (1985a, p.218). The two points are crucial in understanding his use of criticism within the educational context, because although educators sometimes refer to teaching as an art, the language they commonly use in describing or understanding educational practice is not criticism, but the language of science (usually qualitative, empirical data).

There is a definite relationship of educational criticism to educational connoisseurship. Whether within the arts or in education, effective criticism is an act dependent on the powers of perception. It is this ability to see, "to perceive what is sbutle, complex, and important" that is the necessary condition for criticism. This act of "knowledgeable perception" is referred to as connoisseurship, i.e., to know "how to look, to see, and to appreciate." Connoisseurship is the art of appreciation. It is essential to criticism. Without connoisseurship, criticism "is likely to be superficial or empty" (Eisner, 1985a, p.219).

To be a connoisseur is to be involved in the art of appreciation. To be a critic is to be involved in the art of disclosure. Connoisseurship is a private act, consisting in the recognition and appreciation of the qualities of a particular, requiring neither public judgment nor public description of those qualities. Criticism, on the other hand, is "the art of disclosing the qualities of events or objects that connoisseurship perceives. Criticism is the public side of connoisseurship. One can be a connoisseur without the skills of criticism, but one cannot be a critic without the skills of connoisseurship" (Eisner, 1985a, p.223). Thus connoisseurship is essential to critisism, providing the "fundamental core of realization that gives criticism its material" (Eisner, 1985a, p. 220)

Experience in classrooms or educational settings is important to developing educational connoisseurship. Yet it is not a question of cumulative experience in classrooms. More important is the perception of, or "seeing" the experience, as opposed to "looking" or recognition of the experience for purposes of classification. Thus the connoisseur must become a "student of human behavior", seeing subtleties and focusing one's perception, attending to the "essence" of what is occuring. To attend to the essence of an event requires

> ...a set of ideas, theories, or models that enable one to distinguish the significant from the trivial and to place what one sees in an intelligible context. This process is not serial: we do not see and then assess significance; the very ideas that define educational virtue for us operate within the perceptual processes to locate among thousands of possibilities what we choose to see. The essence of perception is that it is selective; there is no value-free mode of seeing (Eisner, 1985a, pp.221-222).

In other words, our "perceptual processes" work within an "array of values and theoretical concepts that influence perception" (p.222). We use these theoretical constructs to better understand and interpret our world, and individuals will use different theories to explain/interpret the same reality.

It is here we begin to understand the demands placed on the educational connoisseur/critic, and the dynamic interplay between the two. It bears repeating that connoisseurship is a private act, criticism is a public act. One can be a connoisseur and not be a critic. But one cannot be a critic without being a connoisseur. To be a connoisseur of education requires "an understanding of different social sciences, different theories of education, and a grasp of the history of education" (Eisner, 1985a, p.222). The educational critic creates

> a rendering of a situation, event, or object that will provide pointers to those aspects of the situation, event, or object that are in some way significant. Now what counts as significant will depend on the theories, models, and values alluded to earlier. But it will also depend on the purposes of the critic.... What is rendered by someone working as an educational critic will depend on his or her purposes as well as the kinds of maps, models, and theories being used. (Eisner, 1985a, pp.223-224)

The notion of rendering is important here, and again, the interplay between connoisseurship and criticism is evident. The critic attempts to render, or translate into another language, to bring out the meaning of, to interpret qualities of something (an object, an event or experience, etc.), to disclose something that might not be evident. The critical importance of language comes into play here, and the distinction between discursive and non-discursive forms of expression is critical.

The technical-rational model discussed earlier in this paper severely limits the discourse about, and interpretation of, educational events. The limitation comes from the language system it uses, and the conceptualizations of schooling that become part of the language structure. This is a highly discursive form of communication, a language of classification, but not a language to use when particular "qualities of life" must be revealed (Eisner, 1985a, p.226).

Within Eisner's alternative paradigm, the mode of discourse is non-discursive, it is metaphorical. The critic must draw upon his/her knowledge/conceptual/experiential base and describe, interpret and evaluate what they experience. This is a language form that "presents to our consciousness what the feeling of those qualities is." This is the language of literature and poetry.

> What enables us to participate empathetically in the events, lives, and situations that the writer portrays is not mere factual description.... What

> gives literature its power is the way in which language has been formed by the writer. It is the "shape" of language as well as the perceptive recognition of the metaphorical, connotative, and symbolic character of particular words and phrases that makes written language literature (Eisner, 1985a, p.226).

The skills of the critic, as both communicator and connoisseur, are evident here. This is where the art and craft of the critic comes into play, translating knowledge from one form to another form. The form of communication used by the critic becomes the public expression through which the "life of feeling" and qualities of experience are made evident and shared. "The arts are not a second-class substitute for expression, they are one of the major means people throughout history have used both to conceptualize and express what has been inexpressible in discursive terms" (Eisner, 1985a, p.226)

There are three aspects, or dimensions, to educational criticism: descriptive, interpretive, and evaluative. The distinctions between the three are more analytical than factual, i.e. they each have a different focus and emphasis.

In the descriptive aspect of educational criticism, the critic attempts to "identify and characterize, portray, or render in language the relevant qualities of educational life." Eisner sees this aspect as making the greatest artistic demands on the critic, i.e., it is this aspect of criticism where the critic's "verbal magic must be most acute" (Eisner, 1985a, pp.230-231).

In the intrepretive aspect of educational criticism, the critic asks and answers the questions: "What does the situation mean to those involved? How does this classroom operate? What ideas, concepts, or theories can be used to explain its major features?" (Eisner, 1985a, p.233). This is where the critics "connoisseurship" is drawn upon to use the multiple theories, viewpoints, frameworks, models, conceptualizations, etc., to interpret the meaning of events in educational settings. The important point is, the critic draws upon his/her knowledge and intreprets classroom reality using differing theoretical models.

In the evaluative aspect of educational criticism, the critic makes an assessment of the educational importance or significance of the experience he/she has described and/or interpreted. Some educational criteria must be applied in order for the critic to make a judgment about the experience. This brings out the normative aspect of, and the value-ladenness of, educational experiences. For example, the function of educational criticism is to "improve the educational process." This can't be done "unless one has a conception of what counts in that process" (Eisner, 1985a, pp.235-238). The conception of "what counts" in that process, what constitutes a quality educational experience, is dependent upon the critic's knowledge-base (connoisseurship). History and philosophy of education are most important areas of study for the educational critic to make judgments regarding the value of educational experiences. History of education provides "the context necessary for purposes of comparisons", and philosophy of education provides "the theores from which grounded value judgments can be made." Hence, a broad undrstanding of the divergent theoretical aspects of education "makes it possible for the

educational critic to appreciate what he or she rejects as well as what he or she accepts within educational practice" (Eisner, 1985a, p.238).

The educational connoisseur/educational critic understands the value-ladenness of his/her judgments. As is the case with any criticism, disagreement with any aspect (descriptive, interpretive, evaluative) of the criticism is open to debate. Eisner sees this as a strength of qualitative inquiry:

> For much too long, educational events have been assessed as though there were only one set of values to be assigned to such events.... Virtually every set of educational events, virtually every educational policy, virtually every mode of school organization or form of teaching has certain virtues and certain liabilities. The more that educational criticism can raise the level of discussion on these matters, the better. (Eisner, 1985a, p.237)

Thus multiple perspectives, diverse theoretical positions expand the dialogue of educators to alternative possibilties, which could help us better understand the complexities of the educational process. The notions of educational connoisseurship and criticism could help us "appreciate" the complexity and provide a broader base for making educational judgments (Eisner, 1985a, p.237).

Concluding Comment

Eisner's perspective on qualitative inquiry directly addresses the limitations of the technical-rational model discussed in the first part of this paper. Connoisseurship/criticism allows for a diversity of methods in epistemology, it allows for diversity of teaching methodology, it allows for alternative evaluation methods other than standardized testing, it allows for participation of students in the over-all educational process, it conceptualizes the whole picture of education as opposed to parts, and it provides a language system that can deal with ambiguity and complexity. In effect, Eisner has provided a language that can help educators "see" education differently, or help them to understand why they "see" education differently.

The conceptualizations of educational connoisseurship and criticism and its attended diverse language system provide educators with a language of possibility that unfreezes educational realities. At the same time, this method of qualitative inquiry provides us with a method for uncovering the meanings of our language that might be blurred by custom and usage, and a method for examining the conceptual-base of our views on school practice.

Because of the moral nature of schooling, what we do in education is worth "another look". Knowledge, percpetion, language, beliefs, practice: there is no separation.

Endnotes

1. The reductionist view I am referring to is related primarily to the limited language system used to talk about, and hence work within, a teaching/learning situation. The language system/world view is technical, efficient, "given", and unproblematic. See Dobson, Dobson, and Koetting (1985).

2. The following assumptions undergird my position in this paper:
   a. The way educators talk affects what they see (perceptions). This phenomenon also works in a reciprocal fashion. Causal priority does not seem particularly important.
   b. Perceptions and language are reflective of the philosophic posture (value system) of the person observing and talking.
   c. The interplay of these three variables (perception, language, and value system) influences the nature of the teaching-learning experiences (Communication).
   d. The language of a profession can a priori determine perceptions and consequently human experience.
   (Dobson, Dobson, & Koetting, 1985)

3. Habermas' "theory of knowledge" has three forms, or processes, of inquiry. Knowledge can be arrived at through (1) the empirical-analytic sciences, (2) the historical-hermeneutic sciences, and (3) the critically oriented sciences (critical theory). These forms or viewpoints of knowledge results in three categories of possible knowledge:

   > Information that expands our power of technical control; interpretations that make possible the orientation of action within common traditions; and analyses that free consciousness from its dependence on hypostatized powers. These viewpoints originate in the interest structure of a species that is linked in its roots to definite means of social organization: work, language and power (Habermas, 1971, p.313).

   These categories of possible knowledge thus establish the "scientific viewpoints" from which we can know reality in any way whatsoever: "orientation toward technical control, toward mutual understanding in the conduct of life, and toward emancipation from seemingly 'natural' constraints (Habermas, 1971, p.311). These modes of inquiry with constitutive interests delineate the way in which individuals generate knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apple, M. (1979). Ideology and Curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd.

Apple, M.W. (1982). Curriculum form and the logic of technical control: Building the possessive individual. In M.W. Apple (Ed.), Cultural and economic reproduction in education: Essays on class, ideology, and the state (pp. 247-274). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd.

Arnheim, R. (1969). Visual thinking. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Aronowitz, S. & Giroux, H.A. (1985). Education under seige MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Coker, H., Medley, D.M., & Soar, R.S. (1980). How valid are expert opinions about effective teaching? Phi Delta Kappan, 62 131-134.

Dobson, R.L., Dobson, J.E., & Koetting, J.R. (1985). Looking at, talking about, and living with children: reflections on the process of schooling. Lanham, MA: University Press of America.

Eisner, E.W. (1985A). The educational imagination: on the design and evaluation of school programs. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan Publish Company.

Eisner, E.W. (1985B). The art of educational evaluation: a personal view. Phil., PA: The Falmer Press.

Fisher, C., Mariave, R., & Filby, N. (1979). Improving teaching by increasing academic learning time. Educational Leadership, 37, 52-54.

Foshay, A.W. (1980). Curriculum Talk. In A. Foshay (Ed.), Considered action for curriculum improvement (pp. 82-94). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.

Frymier, J.R. (1972). A curriculum manifesto. Oceanside, OR: Curriculum Bulletin.

Getzels, J.H., & Jackson, P.W. (1963). The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 506-582). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Giroux, H.A. (1980). teacher education and the ideology of social control. Journal of Education, 162(1), 5-27.

Good, T. (1979). Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school: What we know about it now. Journal of Teacher Education, 30, 52-64.

Good, T., Biddle, B., & Brophy, J. (1975). Teachers make a difference. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Habermas, J. (1971). Knowledge and human interests. Boston: Beacon Press.

Haplin, A. (1969). Change the mythology. Theory Into Practice, 8, 334-338.

Hosford, P.L., ed. (1984). Using what we know about teaching. VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Huebner, D. (1966). Curriculum language and classroom meanings. In J. Macdonald & R. Leeper (Eds.), Language and meaning (pp. 8-26). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hunter, M (1984). Knowing, teaching, and supervising," in Hosford, Philip L., ed. Using What We Know About Teaching. VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kliebard, H. (1975). Bureaucracy and curriculum theory. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: the reconceptualists (pp. 51-69). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Lezotte, L.W., & Bancroft, B.A. (1985). Growing use of the effective schools model for school improvement. Educational Leadership. Vol. 42, #6.

Macdonald, J. (1975). The quality of everyday life in schools. In J.B. Macdonald & E. Zaret (Eds.), Schools in search of meaning (pp. 78-94). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Macdonald, J. (1977). Values bases and issues for curriculum. In A. Molnar & J. Zahorich (Eds.), Curriculum theory (pp. 10-21). Washington, DC: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Raskow, E., Airasian, P., & Madaus, G. (1978). Assessing school and program effectiveness: Estimating teacher level effects. Journal of Educational Measurement, 15, 15-21.

Roberts, J. (1976). Freedom, the child, the teacher: A gap between ideas and actions. Theory Into Practice, 15, 319-325.

Rosenshine, B. (1976). Recent research on teaching behaviors and student achievement. Journal of Teacher Education, 27, 61-64.

Russell, D.H., & Fea, H.R. (1963). Research on teaching reading. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 865-928). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Soltis, J.F. (1973). The passion to teach. Theory into Practice, 12, 46-49.

Tabachnick, R., Popkowitz, S., & Zeichner, K.M. (1979-80). Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange, 10, 12-29.

Tom, A.R. (1977). Critique of performance based teacher education. Educational Forum, 42, 77-87.

Wesker, A. (1976). Words as definitions of experience. Great Britain: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative.

Withall, J., & Lewis, W.W. (1963). Social interaction in the classroom. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 683-714). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.